



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*THE THAT-CLAUSE IN THE AUTHORIZED VERSION
OF THE BIBLE*—By Hubert G. Shearin, Transylvania
University Studies in English, I. Lexington, Ky., 1910.
IV+85 pp.

In this monograph the author treats the subject under three main heads—the Substantive Clause, the Adjective Clause, and the Adverbial Clause. In his introduction he says, “The introductory conjunctive formulæ of the various *that*-clauses have for practical reasons been made the basis of the sub-divisions, so as to group like with like. However, any discrepancy between the form of the clause and its meaning is mitigated by the cross references.” The following notices of the separate topics show that the formal classification has obscured the syntax in numerous cases where there are no cross references, and that certain apparently similar formulæ are really of different origin and function. The practical reasons for such a purely formal arrangement do not appear: convenience of reference could have been provided for by an index to the formulæ. The sub-divisions will here be considered separately. Those under the Substantive Clause are: Subject Clause, Object Clause, Clause of Specification, Predicate Clause, Appositive Clause, Absolute Clause, Omission of *That* in the Substantive Clause, *How That*-Clauses.

The statement (p. 4) that certain “*that*-clauses, though grammatically adjectival, may perhaps be considered as logical subjects—as in Gen. 45.8 So now it was not you that sent me hither—appears to involve a logical fallacy, as comparison with the original indicates.¹ It is not the *that*-clause that is logical subject, but the word that it limits, which is made the predicate for emphasis. The corresponding word in the original is grammatically the subject.

The observation (p. 5) that clauses like Gen. 27.20 How is it that thou hast found it so quickly? and Acts 21.35 so it was that he was borne of the souldiers, verge upon the consecutive, is not substantiated. In the original of the first type no trace of result is visible, and none, so far as I can see, in the English. *It* refers, not to anything that produces a result, but to the succeeding *that*-clause as a fact. In the examples of the second type with *so* the English is equally free from idea of result: *so* is the very common Elizabethan adverb of pure manner, ‘thus’, not the derived

¹The original will not always determine the syntax of the translation, but it often serves in doubtful cases to show the thought of the translators, and thus to help determine the syntax.

correlative *so*, and *it* as above refers to the substantive clause. The meaning is not "something [it] was such that [as a result] etc.", but "it was thus, namely, that etc." The Vulgate, *Contigit ut portaretur*, which is cited, lends only specious color to the consecutive theory. Even in old Latin the *ut*-clause of result had long become purely substantive after *contigit* and the like.²

The clauses after *than* (pp. 5 ff.) are likewise without consecutive relation, but are purely substantive. The occurrence of the substantivized infinitive in the originals quoted and in the English (Ex. 14.12 *it had bene better for vs to serue the Egyptians, then that wee should die*) points to the purely substantive construction. The Latin *ut* with the subjunctive (as in I. Sam. 27.1 *melius est ut fugiam*) lends no aid to the consecutive interpretation, for that probably never was consecutive.³

The two instances of *that*-clauses after *than*, Gen. 36.7, Isa. 28.20, which are described as adverbial, may possibly be constructed on the analogy of clauses like *so great (etc.) that*, and may therefore contain some consecutive force. The remaining examples of *than*-clauses with *that* omitted (like Ps. 40.5) are, however, probably not all *that*-clauses, but are of varying elliptical structure. Cf. Oxf. Dic. s. v. *than*.

Under Object Clause (p. 7) Lev. 13.8 if the Priest see, that behold, the scab spreadeth in the skin, is mentioned as noteworthy without assigned reason. It is noteworthy, it seems to me, as an interesting modern method of conceiving the object clause that points to the development of the conjunction *that* out of the demonstrative. Here the exclamatory demonstrative *behold* points vividly to the following fact in the *that*-clause just as the demonstrative *that* once did, and still may in such a sentence as "See that! the scab spreadeth in the skin!"

Sentences like Gen. 1.4 And God saw the light, that it was good, are explained as a "species of prolepsis" by which "the logical subject of the object clause is for emphasis brought forward into the main clause as object of the leading verb." The theory of prolepsis is here, I believe, only due to our modern grammatical conceptions by which we rationalize an older style of thought characteristic of English, especially of the popular idiom. It also occurs in the popular Hebrew and Greek originals, but less frequently. It illustrates the principle which Professor C. A. Smith calls "the short reach in English syntax". The sentence, *God saw the light, that it*

² See Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin* (Boston, 1910), p. 299, b.

³ See Bennett, p. 238.

was good, represents the normal psychological order of ideas—perception and judgment. The construction is constantly in use today in vivid language. Gen. 18.19 I know him, that hee will command his children, is more nearly equivalent to “I know this man: he will command his children,” than it is to the more sophisticated “I know that this man will command his children.” The earlier and more natural construction is often more appropriate: note the effectiveness of the following statement considered in the light of a situation bristling with human nature—Thou knowest the people, that they are set on mischief (Ex. 32.22). A shade of effectiveness—Aaron’s throwing the responsibility off by appeal to Moses’ experience with the Children of Israel—would be lost in the more complex form of expression.

II Sam. 14.11 hardly belongs in this group, for the *that*-clause is rather adverbial and final than substantive.

The sub-division of the Substantive Clause of Specification seems unjustified as a separate category. Many clauses belonging definitely to other categories may, like numerous infinitive constructions, be thought of as specifying the application of the governing clause, but it is better, and often just as obvious, to classify them in the proper historical categories. Substantive *that*-clauses depending on nouns like *commandment*, *confidence*, *hope*, *knowledge*, *oath*, *sentence*, and on adjectives like *confident*, *ignorant*, *sure*, *willing*, are simply extensions by analogy of object clauses after verbs of corresponding meaning. The same is true after such phrases as *make covenant*, *lift up the hand*, *take heed*, *make intercession*, *write letters*, *have need*, *call to record*, *give sign*, *show sign*, and so on. In a few instances with nouns like *cause*, *knowledge*, and adjectives like *sure*, *ignorant*, the early construction with *of* + *that*-clause probably assisted in the extension. With nouns like *joy* (cf. John 16.21), and with adjectives like *angry*, *ashamed*, *blessed*, *grieved*, and verbs like *care*, *marvel*, *praise*, *rejoice*, *thank*, *wonder*, etc. the *that*-clause is most easily explained as causal, so that these clauses would more properly be classed as adverbial.⁴ This construction after certain expressions such as *have pleasure* (Ezek. 18.23) is often hard to distinguish from the object clause after similar verbs.⁵ Wrongly assigned to this sub-division are: Ephes. 3.14-16 For this cause I bow my knees vnto the Father That he would grant you. Here the *that*-clause

⁴ Shearin fails to recognize at all this common Elizabethan causal clause with simple *that*.

⁵ See my monograph in the Chaucer Society (Second Series, 44, 1909), pp. 68f., for a similar ambiguity in the use of the infinitive as complement or cause.

is not subordinate to *cause*, but is final after *bow etc.* Again, among the examples with *show (etc.) sign that* is placed Judges 20.38 there was an appointed signe that they should make a great flame with smoke rise vp out of the citie. The author has apparently misunderstood the passage. After several repulses from Gibeah by the Benjamites, the Israelites manage to get liers in wait between themselves and the besieged city. They then feign another retreat, thus drawing the Benjamites off till the liers in wait, as agreed upon, fire the city. On seeing the smoke—the appointed sign—the Israelites turn and confound their enemies. The *that*-clause does not specify the application of *sign* or depend on it, but it is the sign, the clause being appositive.

I Kings 8.18 thou diddest well that it was in thine heart, belongs in a special category. See the Oxf. Dic. s. v. *that* conj. 1b, where this passage is quoted. The examples in the Oxf. Dic. point to the development of this construction by analogy from *that*-clauses in apposition to a single word, as in the example, Helmstan ða undæde æedyde ðæt he Æðseredes belt forstæl. The second example quoted would easily be transitional to the present construction.

Shearin's example from Ps. 50.16 what hast thou to doe, to declare my Statutes, or that thou shouldest take my Couenant in thy mouth? belongs with the group discussed by him on pp. 50-52 (See below, p. 161). The same is true of Ezek. 18.2, placed here by the author, though he places the parallel Isa. 3.15 in the other category.

The category of Specification is likewise inadequate to account for the clauses after interjections (pp. 25 ff.). The *that*-clause after words like *woe* and *alas* is probably different historically from that after optative interjections. The Oxf. Dic. assigns the former, in part at least, to the causal *that*. The Oxford offers no explanation of the second group, though it can hardly be doubted that they are extensions of the object clause after verbs of optative meaning.

The explanation of the development of *would God that* in the order *I would—I would to God—would to God—would God* (in which the "suppression of *to* renders *God* an apparent subject of *would*"), is directly opposed to the facts. The expression *would God that* appears to be equally old with *I would that*, and moreover in the former *God* is the real subject. Cf. Chaucer, *Book of the Duchess* 665: But god wolde I had ones or twyes etc., and D 1103 So wolde god myne herte wolde breste, "might God grant". The same construction is found in Old High German and is preserved in modern German with *Gott* still subject of the preterite

subjunctive. I suggest that *would to God* is a cross between *would God* and *I would*, with *to* later inserted to rationalize the expression *I would God*. However this may be, it is of interest that in the Bible there is still a difference between *would God* and *I would*. In all the six cases of *would God* cited the thing wished for is conceived of as directly in the hands of God, death being usually referred to. On the other hand in the nine or ten instances of *I would* some ordinary wish is expressed without reference to divine intervention. In one case of *would to God* the wish refers to death, and in the others is general, as with *I would*.

In connection with the *that*-clause as Predicate, a distinction might appropriately have been made between such pure predicates as Eccl. 7.12 the excellencie of knowledge is, that wisdom giueth life, and those based on the analogy of the object clause, the subject being a noun implying action, as in Job 34.36 My desire is that Iob may be tried vnto the end.

Among appositive *that*-clauses are included first some examples that the author regards as belonging equally well to the group of clauses of specification. Among them is Eccl. 7.10 What is the cause that the former dayes were better? This is certainly not appositive at all; it belongs rather to the group (see above, p. 149) analogically related to the object clause. The older construction, *cause of that* + clause, indicates the objective relation, as does the analogy with verbs of causing. Again, John 16.21 ioy that a man is borne, is probably not appositive, but the *that*-clause is a causal clause depending on *ioy*.⁶

Under what the author calls true appositives is quoted Gen. 34.15 in this will we consent vnto you: If ye will be as we be, that euery male of you be circumcised, with the implication that the *that*-clause is appositive to *this*. But it is the conditional clause, *If be*, that is in apposition with *this*, and the *that*-clause is in apposition with *as we be*. John 16.4, included here, is an ordinary final clause. John 18.14 gaue counsell that, Rom. 4.13 the promise that, II Cor. 1.12 testimony that, Phil. 1.20 expectation and hope that, all belong to the group mentioned above (p. 149) as analogous to object clauses. Acts 3.18 is an object clause after *had sheued*. In II Cor. 12.8 the *that*-clause is object of *besought*, and *this thing* refers to the thorn in the flesh, so that the clause is not appositive.

Under the Clause Absolute are mentioned clauses that the

⁶ For further discussion of the treatment of *that* causal see below, p. 164.

author calls grammatically absolute approaching the causal, such as John 6.46 Not that any man hath seene the Father. These clauses are, however, not absolute, but elliptical, and they are of at least two kinds historically (cf. Oxf. Dic. s. v. *that* conj. 2b), some of them going back to the causal *that*, and others to the object clause after omitted verbs of saying and the like. The distinction can be seen in the examples quoted. In the first place, John 12.6 This he said, not that he cared for the poore; but because hee was a thiefe, shows the original of the first type in its unelliptical form, the *that*-clause being causal and depending on *this he said*; this example belongs, therefore, not in this category, but among the other causal clauses.⁶ From this causal clause we may pass easily to those in which the causal relation is dependent more on what is implied than expressed, as in Acts 28.19 I was constrained to appeale vnto Cesar, not that I had ought to accuse my nation of. The remaining examples that belong here are of the second type—"I do not say that"—as in John 6.45f. Euery man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, commeth vnto me, not that any man hath seene the father; so II Cor. 3.5, Phil. 4.11. Wrongly included here are II Cor. 13.7, in which the *that*-clause is final; and Ezek. 23.40, which the author says is "absolute with merely additive function." The *that*-clause is one of the accusations of Aholah and Aholibah, being in apposition with *abominations* in v. 36, and parallel with the other appositives in vv. 37, 38.

To the list of substantive clauses with omitted *that* (pp. 31-34, 49) should be added Num. 9.21 (quoted on p. 67, 4); Gen. 8.13; Ex. 36.7; Gal. 4.15; I John 3.17; Rev. 2.2; 9.10; 22.9, which I have noted incidentally.

Shearin explains the *how that*-clause as a coalescence of object *how*-clauses of manner with simple *that*-clauses. He quotes four examples to show their similarity that could bring about such a coalescence. Only one, however, is a combination of a true clause of manner and a simple object *that*-clause, as is clear from the Greek original and the Vulgate—Acts 9.27.⁷ In two of the other three examples, Josh. 14.12 and II Kings 19.25, *how* has already lost its force of manner, and the clause is equivalent to a *that*-clause. I Cor. 15.3-5 *how that*—that—that—that, is an example of the result of the "coalescence", not of its cause, which it is cited to illustrate. The colorless use of *how that* is, however, probably not the result of a coalescence of *how*-clauses and *that*-clauses, but

⁶ For further discussion of the treatment of *that* causal see below, p. 164.

⁷ Shearin entirely obscures the force of this passage and its originals by misquotation. See below, where it is correctly quoted.

is more probably due to the frequently occurring addition of *that* to conjunctive words, as in *when that*, *if that*, etc. In fact, in the above examples (excepting of course Acts 9.27) *that* may be of the character of pro-conjunction in form, though the sense of the first conjunction be weakened. This is indicated in Kings by the marginal reading, *hast thou not heard how I haue made it long agoe*, and *formed it of ancient times?*

Whatever the genesis of the *how that*-clause from the *how* clause, a more suggestive arrangement of material would have been in the order of the gradual weakening of the modal force of *how*. Acts 9.27, and declared vnto them how hee had seene the Lord in the way, and that hee had spoken to him, and how hee had preached boldly at Damascus (πῶς—ἔτι—πῶς; quomodo—quia—quomodo), illustrates the *how*-clause with its full force of manner, as the original and the Vulgate show. Numerous ambiguous cases, in which the degree of manner is doubtful, like Acts 23.30 And when it was tolde me, how that the Iewes laid waite for the man, show the transition stage to those in which *how* has lost all its force of manner, as in Ex. 9.29 thou mayest know how that the earth is the LORDS.

The so-called proleptical *how that*-clauses here treated are subject to the same explanation I have given above (p. 149), and this explanation applies to I Cor. 1.26, designated by Shearin as unique.

The Adjective Clause is treated under the sub-divisions *That* as Object of a Preposition, *That* as an Adverbial Accusative, *That* as a Compound Relative Pronoun, The Consecutive Adjective Clause, The Final Adjective Clause, The Omission of *That* in the Adjective Clause.

Under the Adjective Clause is treated the use of the relatives *that* and *which*. Shearin quotes Grainger,⁸ who in turn quotes Smith⁹ regarding the greater "carrying power" of *which* as compared with *that*. None of them, however, mention the reason for this greater carrying power—namely, that in English *which* has higher stress than *that*. This is immediately connected with the predominance of *that* as a restrictive, and of *which* as an explanatory and progressive relative. For in the use of the more highly stressed *which*, the relative becomes by its emphasis separated to another phrase group from that of its antecedent; whereas the low-stressed *that* throws the emphasis on the phrase group containing the antecedent, and is thus closely connected with it. When the

⁸ James M. Grainger, *Studies in the Syntax of the King James Version*, University of North Carolina Press, 1907.

⁹ C. Alphonso Smith, *Studies in Syntax*, Boston, 1906.

relative is omitted, the connection is closer still. Compare the following: "Here is a good book, which I brought with me to read;" "This is the book that I want;" "This is the book I want."

Stress and closeness of connection explain at least some of Smith's examples.¹⁰ *And* (or *but*) in such cases always follows a logical pause, and in such a position the combination *and that*, both low-stressed, is difficult, the natural tendency being to give undue stress to *and*; while *and which* allows the normal stress relation. Besides this, in the majority of Smith's examples the first relative clause has a distinctly closer logical connection to its antecedent than has the second. Toller's sentence quoted, "There are other works than these just mentioned that have been connected with Alfred's name, but which for different reasons can hardly be considered to be of equal importance with them," is essentially equivalent to "There are other works connected with Alfred's name, but they can hardly etc." Of course it is natural that the relative most closely connected with its antecedent should usually come first, with the less restrictive one following.

When we come to the Bible instances, the closer connection of *that* to its antecedent accounts not only for most of the cases where *that* precedes *which*, but also where it follows. No absolute uniformity can of course be expected, as Grainger and Shearin emphasize; yet a comparison with the Hebrew and Greek originals makes it evident that in the great majority of instances a relative pronoun of the original is represented in English by *which*, while adjective clause relations of a more restrictive nature, such as the article+participle, the construct or the genitive relation, descriptive nouns, and the like, are usually represented in English by *that*, especially when it is desired to differentiate between the two relations. In the Greek of the New Testament a frequent construction for the looser relative connection is the noun or pronoun with post-positive article+participle (sometimes an appositive participle or noun), adding some characterization with more or less closeness of connection. This is regularly rendered by *which*. I have compared with the original all the *that's*, *who's*, and *which's* of the book of Revelation, and have found that of about 100 relative *that's*, 85 translate the article+participle, as ὁ κρατῶν = he that holdeth; 4 (restrictive) translate a relative pronoun; 12 (restrictive) translate the post-positive article+participle (or analogous construction); 1 (non-restrictive) a relative pronoun.

¹⁰ I recognize the value of Smith's principle in certain cases; but I believe it is not the only one affecting the use of the two relatives.

It is sometimes difficult to distinguish between restrictive and non-restrictive *which*, but as nearly as I can determine, of about 130 *who*'s and *which*'s 34 restrictive and 24 non-restrictive represent relative pronouns; 30 restrictive and 23 non-restrictive represent the Greek post-positive article+participle (or analogous construction). Of about 20 exceptions several are the phrases *they which*, *them which*, *those which*, *those things which*, of more or less stereotyped nature, in many of which, however, *which* has the force of *qualis*. Many of the exceptions in the use of *which* and *that* can be accounted for by circumstances peculiar to each context,¹¹ but these figures establish the general rule that the use of *that* or *which* depends largely on the form of expression in the original. Note the following characteristic examples:—

Rom. 8.34 It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen againe, who is euen at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for vs = Greek participle—participle—relative—relative; Rev. 2.1 he that holdeth the seuen starres in his right hand, who walketh in the midst = participle—post-positive participle; 2.14 them that holde the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac = participle—relative; 3.10 the houre of temptation, which shall come vpon all the world, to try them that dwell vpon the earth = post-positive participle—participle; 13.14 deceiue them that dwel on the earth, by the meanes of those miracles which he had power to do . . ., saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an Image to the beast, which had the wound = participle—relative—participle—relative; Mark 15.7 there was one named Barabbas, which lay bound with them that had made insurrection with him, who had committed murder = appositive participle—participle—relative. Josh. 24.17 he it is that brought vs vp and our fathers out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage, & which did those great signes = Hebrew participle—relative; Judges 4.2 Iabin king of Canaan: that reigned in Hazor, the capitaine of whose host was Sisera, which dwelt in Harosheth. Here *that* introduces the closer connection, *which* the looser, preserving the difference of the Hebrew, which reads literally, “who reigned in Hazor; and the capitaine of his host was Sisera,

¹¹ Note, for example, Luke 1.45 And blessed is she that beleueed, for there shalbe a performance of those things. Here the margin has, or *which beleueed*, *that there*. Here the change to *which* is obviously to avoid the repetition of *that* in different senses. In Rev. 3.2 strengthen the things which remaine, that are ready to die = adjective—relative, the use of *which* in the first clause throws the emphasis on the important part.

and he dwelt etc.” Judg. 20.46 all which fell that day of Benjamin were twentie and fwe thousand men that drew the sword = article+participle—participle, the first relative idea receiving in Hebrew more emphasis than the second, as it does in English. Though both clauses are restrictive in English, the high-stressed relative contains the important idea: “all those who fell were twenty-five thousand soldiers.”

The two examples quoted by Grainger of *which* restrictive (p. 30), Gen. 6.2 and 11.6, both have relative pronouns in the Hebrew.¹² Among the examples that Shearin gives to illustrate the greater carrying power of *which*, *that* represents in the Hebrew and the Greek a closer connection than *which* in the following cases: Deut. 30.7 on them that hate thee, which persecuted thee; Eccles. 8.12 it shall be well with them that feare God, which feare before him; II Cor. 10.18 not he that commendeth himselfe is approued, but whom the Lord commendeth—all these translating the original construction participle—relative.¹³ In Josh. 5.6 all the people that were men of warre which came out of Egypt were consumed, the translation represents noun of agent—participle (Vulgate: *bellatores viri—qui egressus est*), the same differentiation being preserved between the relative ideas; Josh. 24.33 a hill that pertained to Phinehas his son, which was giuen him, = possessive genitive—relative; Lev. 15.12 (misprinted 7), and Josh. 17.16, quoted by Shearin to show the greater carrying power of *which*, are irrelevant, for the antecedent is repeated before the second relative.¹⁴

¹² In Gen. 6.2 they took them wiues, of all which they chose, *which* shows some of its earlier force of *qualis*. This doubtless had some influence on the use of *which* in instances where we might expect *that*. This use of *which* is still current. In a recent mathematical work I noted a number of restrictive *which's* like the following: “Draw a line which shall pass through A and B.”

¹³ It is of interest to note that the glossarist of the Lindisfarne Gospels has taken a similar means of representing the close connection indicated by the Latin present participle; namely, the use of the asyndetic relative clause. See the article by Professor George O. Curme in this *Journal* for April, 1912, p. 181.

¹⁴ Grainger's view that *which* is used in Leviticus 15.12 because of its separation [by the word *toucheth*] from its antecedent *he* can hardly be maintained in view of the following passages from the immediate context: v. 4 whereon he lieth, that hath the issue; 6.9 what saddle soeuer he rideth vpon, that hath the issue; 11 whomsoeuer hee toucheth that hath the issue. More important here is the fact that every *that*-clause is restrictive, as also in verses 7, 8, 10, and 13. In 12 the relative of the Hebrew is rendered by *that* introducing a restrictive clause. The use of *which* as the second relative in this verse may be due to considerations of variety; at any rate it appears to be exceptional in this context.

In II Cor. 12.6 about that which hee seeth me to be, or that¹⁵ hee heareth of me, where the order of *that* and *which* is reversed, it is accounted for by the difference in the original (ὅπερ δὲ βλέπει με ἡ ἀκούει ἐξ ἐμοῦ), *that* by its low stress connecting the verbs *seeth* and *heareth* more closely than *which* connects its clause as a phrase group to the main clause; thus the effect of the original is secured. The case is similar in Gen. 24.7 The LORD God of Heaven which tooke mee from my fathers house, and which spake vnto me, and that sware vnto me. Here the obviously closer connection of the last two verbs with each other than with the first verb, is not expressed in the Hebrew or the Septuagint, but is indicated in the English and the Vulgate (*qui locutus est mihi & iuravit*). So in I Kings 10.8 thy seruants, which stand continually before thee, and that heare thy wisdom, the English suggests the logical connection between *stand* and *heare*, not formally indicated in the Hebrew. The Vulgate, again, shows it: *qui stant coram te semper & audiunt*. In Isa. 51.10 and Jer. 27.8 *that* introduces the second of two closely parallel relative clauses, while the connection to the main clause is made by *which*. Compare v. 9, where, no such differentiation being needed, *that* is used. In Num. 14.36-37 *which* and *who* represent relatives in the Hebrew, and *that* represents a participle. In Lev. 4.18 And he shal put some of the blood vpon the hornes of the altar, which is before the LORD, that is in the Tabernacle,¹⁵ where the Hebrew has parallel relatives, the English gives less emphasis to the last clause, in agreement with the Vulgate: *quod est coram Domino in tabernaculo*.¹⁶ In I Kings 16.27 the *which*-clause is less restrictive than the *that*-clause, as is also indicated by the punctuation.

Even Gen. 37.6 and 10 by means of the use of *which* and *that* show more than a tendency to euphony and variety, which they are quoted to show. The Hebrew shows no distinction between the relatives, but in English there is a difference in the effect of the two: in Heare, I pray you, this

¹⁵ Note also the separation of *that* from its antecedent. Cf. note 14.

¹⁶ In a number of instances the form of the English, when different from the Hebrew or Greek, agrees with the Vulgate. Note, e. g., Rom. 8.28 where the Greek has participles in both cases, but the Vulgate has participle—*qui* = English *that*—*who*. Also Judg. 6.11, where the Hebrew has two relatives, but the Vulgate = *quæ erat in Ephra & pertinebat*, and the English = *which was in Ophra, that pertained vnto Ioash*. Cf. Rom. 10.5, 6, where, however, *which* has the force of *qualis*. Regarding the influence of the Vulgate on the translators, it should be remembered that it would often be unconscious, owing to their familiarity with it, probably more than with the Hebrew and Greek.

dréame which I haue dreamed, the relative clause is an emphasized separate statement = "I have had a dream: hear it." In v. 10 What is this dréame that thou hast dreamed? the relative clause is more closely attached to the main, and so receives less separate emphasis: "What is this dream of yours?"¹⁷

In the classification of *that* as an adverbial accusative, it seems rather meaningless to classify according to the grammatical construction of the antecedent of *that*; e. g., nothing is contributed to the elucidation of the syntax of the *that*-clause by placing Deut. 31.14 thy dayes approach that thou must die, under *day* as subject, and 4.10 teach . . . the day that thou stoodst before the LORD, under *day* as object. The syntax and meaning of the clause is the same in both cases. A more significant arrangement would be to place together the examples showing the same relation of *that* to its antecedent; as, point of time or duration of time. Mark 6.21 And when a conuenient day was come, that Herod on his birth day made a supper, may be consecutive; on the other hand, I doubt whether John 12.23 The houre is come, that the Sonne of man should be glorified, is consecutive, as Shearin believes. The original points to a final clause as the basis of the construction, according to the Hebrew conception.¹⁸ In the English, however, the clause has probably merely the force of an adjective clause limiting *hour*: "the hour is come in which the son of man was to be (should be) glorified." Whatever final idea there is resides not in the adverbial nature of the *that*-clause, but in the force of *should*.¹⁹

¹⁷ I do not attempt to say to what extent the nice distinctions between *that* and *which* are due to the translators of the Authorized Version and what to their predecessors. An exhaustive study of the use of the two relatives in connection with the originals would doubtless yield interesting results.

¹⁸ See Winer's New Testament Grammar, and Burton's Moods and Tenses of New Testament Greek, on the passage.

¹⁹ Cf. heading to John 13 discovereth to Iohn by a token that Iudas should betray him. So 13.1 and 16.32 in which *shall* shows the force of destiny and fairly represents the final force of the original. The *that*-clause as an adjective (not adverbial) element with final force is to be explained as denoting, not the purpose of the verb, but the end or application of the noun. This construction is related to the similar construction of the infinitive as an adjective modifier depending on the noun. *That*-clauses and infinitive phrases are interchangeable in this use. Cf. Time to go, with Time that he should go. See also Ex. 14.12, Ps. 50.16. Likewise in N. T. Greek the constructions are interchangeable. The three passages referred to above all have *iva*-clauses. In Lk. 1.57, and I Peter 4.17 the Greek has dependent infinitive, with genitive inflection showing its immediate dependence

Why Shearin places here John 19.27 From that hour that, it is hard to see. The passage reads, from that houre that disciple tooke her vnto his owne home.

Under the heading *That* as a Compound Relative Shearin explains *that* as a contraction of *that that*. The present tendency with some scholars is to regard the single *that* as the original construction. The subject needs a larger collection of material and a fuller treatment than it has yet received. The Oxford Dictionary (s. v. *That* demonstrative and relative) appears to regard *that* relative with omitted antecedent as an earlier construction than *that* demonstrative with asyndetic relative clause, the earliest citation for the former being 888 where *that* refers to things and 1320 where *that* refers to persons; and for the latter 1523. Professor Curme, however, quotes Hwa is þæt þe slog? from Rushworth Matt. 26.28,²⁰ where þæt refers to a person. The Oxford editors admit that distinction between demonstrative and relative is difficult to make, as stress is uncertain, and in the earlier stages there was probably less variation between demonstrative and relative (s. v. *That*, demonstrative, introductory note). Moreover, there must be considered not only the earlier forms of *that*, but other inflected forms of the same pronoun. When these are all placed together the early occurrence of the demonstrative followed by asyndetic clause is much more evident. Professor Curme cites among others from O. E. the following examples:

Beow. 1397 gode þancode þæs se man gespræc;
Gen. 1757 Lisse selle þam þe wirðiað;
Rushworth Mark 9.23 alle mæhtiga ðæm gelefes.²¹

on the noun. Similar is Rev. 11.18. All three are rendered in English by *that*-clauses, as in the other cases. Note Tyndale's rendering of John 12.23: *that the sonne of man must be glorified*.

²⁰ *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Jan. 1912, p. 26. See Professor Curme's articles in the *Journal* of Jan. and April, 1912.

²¹ See many other examples in Professor Curme's articles in the *Journal*, vols. X, p. 339; XI, pp. 26, 180. Surely he is right in rejecting the theory of attraction to explain the cases of these old demonstratives. I would suggest, however, that Professor Curme goes too far in interpreting most of these examples and many others throughout his articles as if the writers had no feeling of the relative force of these demonstrative forms. Many of them were doubtless felt as relative as early as the *Beowulf*, for changes of syntactical conceptions always long precede the corresponding formal changes, or, indeed, the form never changes but receives a new syntactical function. But the examples are equally significant as formal survivals of an earlier syntax. Moreover, the early conception of a relative force is not inconsistent with the survival of the demonstrative force in many later cases having the same origin. Among students of syntax the principle is even yet too little recognized that old constructions do

I incline to the view that the so-called compound relative *that* is a survival of the demonstrative *that* with following asyndetic relative clause ("omitted relative"). It is noteworthy that in Shearin's first group *that* is always neuter, and frequently still has considerable stress; e. g., Gen. 32.23 and sent ouer that hee had. Compare Gen. 39.6 And he left all that he had, in Ioseph's hand: and he knew not ought he had, saue the bread which he did eate, where *ought* occupies the same syntactical position as *that* in the previous example.²² Compare also Gen. 12.18 What is this that thou hast done vnto me? with Gen. 26.10 What is this thou hast done vnto vs? Also note the present-day "What's that you have in your hand?" The demonstrative construction with asyndetic relative clause is still alive.

The nearness to the demonstrative construction is shown especially when a preposition precedes *that*, as in I Kings 10.15 Besides that he had of the merchant men; I Sam. 24.19 the LORD reward thee good, for that thou hast done vnto me this day; II Sam. 24.10 I haue sinned greatly in that I haue done; I Cor. 10.13 tempted aboue that you are able; John 16.19 enquire . . . of that I saide. It seems most natural to regard the demonstrative as the earlier construction in such cases and still formally surviving, in agreement with the history of *that* in other constructions, rather than to consider it a late development from a restressing of relative *that*.²³ The examples treated on p. 49 under The Omission of *That* probably therefore belong to this category. When, as in the example from Ex. 10.28 in that day thou seest my face, the

not usually die after giving birth to new ones. All chronological treatment of syntactical phenomena must take that into account. A tenth century example may be more modern than a twentieth century one.

²² This passage is an excellent example of differentiation in the rendering of the Hebrew relative clauses. The Hebrew is, somewhat literally, "And he left all which [was] to him in Joseph's hand; and he knew not anything with him except the bread which he ate." The first of the Hebrew relatives is the most restrictive, the second relative idea has no relative, and the third is least closely connected with the antecedent. With this the English corresponds exactly: *that*—no relative—*which*.

²³ Our modern feeling in this construction by which we rationalize *that* as a compound relative, is probably influenced by the use of relative *what* in sentences like "He found what he wanted," where *what* is felt as equal to *that which*, but probably originated in the indirect question, and the general relative *what*. The origin of *that* in an apparently similar use is probably different, and our assimilation of it to the *what*-construction obscures to our feeling in all but the most obvious cases the fact that *that* is at bottom demonstrative and followed by the asyndetic relative clause. I note that Schmidt in his Shakespeare Lexicon regards *that* in such cases as the demonstrative.

demonstrative precedes a noun, its nature is unmistakable.²⁴

The second group of Compound Relatives (p. 47.2), like Neh. 5.2 For there were that said (cf. v. 3 Some there were that saide), are evidently a different construction, *that* being invariably a low-stressed relative with antecedent clearly implied in the substantive verb.

The Adverbial Clause is treated under the sub-divisions Consecutive Clause, Final Clause, Causal Clause, Temporal Clause, Conditional Clause, Clauses of Specification, *That* as a Pro-Conjunction, Omission of *That* in the Adverbial Clause.

Under the Consecutive Clause (pp. 50 ff.) the full list is referred to the appendix, and only the "more interesting cases" noted in detail. Among these, however, are indiscriminately placed examples that need classification. One group is separated—*that*-clauses of result dependent on questions, like Gen. 20.9 what haue I offended thee, that thou hast brought on me . . . a great sinne? In this class the *that*-clause is regarded as a consequence attributed to an implied answer to the question of the governing clause. Furthermore, the examples given by Shearin are of at least four different sorts. In one the *that*-clause contains a present or past indicative expressing an actual result of the fact implied in the protasis; as in Matt. 8.27 What maner of man is this, that euen the winds and the Sea obey him? John 9.2 who did sinne, this man, or his parents, that he was borne blinde?

In the second, the clause contains a future indicative of hypothetical result; as John 7.35 Whither will hee goe, that we shall not find him?

In the third, the clause contains a subjunctive, or its analytical equivalent, expressing hypothetical result; as Ex. 3.11 Who am I, that I should goe vnto Pharaoh?

Finally, the clause may have the form of hypothetical result, though by inference referring to a fact; as in Ruth 2.10 Why haue I found grace in thine eyes, that thou shouldest take knowledge of me? I Sam. 17.26 who is this vncircumcised Philistine, that he should defie the armies of the liuing God? So Ex. 9.17.

With clauses of the third and fourth class should also

²⁴ It is hard to see why Shearin offers a different explanation for I Sam. 11.9 To morrow by that time the sunne be hote, explaining *that* as a demonstrative with progressive relative force. It is not a progressive relative in the usual sense of that term (cf. Sweet's *English Grammar*, §218). This is obviously an old construction in English. Cf. Rushw. Luke 12.50 oðð ða hwil geended sie (=usque dum perficiatur), quoted by Curme in the *Journal* XI, 181.

Shearin (p. 47) places II Cor. 12.6 in this category, and also (p. 40) in that of the ordinary relative, without comment. It is undoubtedly the latter.

be classed in similarity of relation to the protasis, those, recorded elsewhere by Shearin, in which the interrogative governing clause is replaced by a negative statement, and the *that*-clause is thought of as a consequence attributed hypothetically to the thing that is denied in the protasis; as Deut. 30.12 It is not in Heauen, that thou shouldest say; Judg. 21.22 yee did not giue vnto them at this time, that you should be guiltie; Isa. 53.2 there is no beautie that we should desire him; so Gen. 40.15, Lev. 11.43.

These idiomatic consecutive clauses which are explained by the fact implied in the governing clause are different in sense from other ordinary result clauses, even when the latter are hypothetical and depend on interrogative statements; e. g., Num. 14.13 wherefore hath the LORD brought vs vnto this land, to fall by the sword, that our wiues, and our children should be a pray? So Num. 20.4, Isa. 49.15, II Sam. 9.3.

Among these interrogative sentences Shearin includes several that do not belong here; two have only an external similarity—Gen. 31.26 What hast thou done, that thou hast stollen away vnawares to me? Here the *that*-clause is not consecutive but appositional with *what hast thou done*, the meaning being, "What did you mean by stealing away thus?" The meaning is apparent if this is contrasted with I Sam. 20.1 What haue I done . . . that he seeketh my life? Parallel is Judg. 8.1 Why hast thou serued vs thus, that thou calledst vs not when thou wentest to fight? Job 41.17 is erroneously classed among the interrogative clauses.

Several examples classed as consecutive clauses do not belong here; e. g., Ruth 2.7 so shee came, and hath continued euen from the morning vntill now, that she taried a little in the house. *That* in this case means 'when'; see the Oxf. Dic. s. v. *That*, p. 254, 6b, where several examples are given, among them two that closely parallel this: 1648 Until just that we came; 1780 till about half a year ago, that my ill stars directed me. I have noted instances of this meaning of *that* in Chaucer, Leg. Prol. A 54 Til on the morwe, that hit is dayes light; and Milton, Comus 642 but little reckoning made, Till now that this extremity compelled.²⁵ II Thess.

²⁵ It may be doubted whether the use of *now that* in the sense of 'since', 'seeing that', referred to in the Oxf. Dic. (Cf. *Now*, 12 b) is parallel to this example. Here *that* carries the essential meaning, while in *now that* = 'since' *that* is unnecessary, *now* formerly, and sometimes even yet, being used alone, at first doubtless as a simple adverb of time in a paratactic construction with the causal relation only implied, as in "Now you are here: let us begin." *That* was apparently added as it was in *when that*, *if that*, and the like. Cf. W. S. St. John 5.14 Nu þu eart hal geworden; ne synga þu.

2.6 And now yee know what withholdeth, that hee might bee reuealed in his time, is not consecutive but final, as the Greek shows and according to the idea suggested by the phrase *in his time*, which Shearin omits. The man of sin is withheld in order that he may not appear before his appointed time. II Peter 1.8 they make you that yee shall neither be barren, nor vnfruitful, is classed as consecutive, and this agrees with the classification of the Oxf. Dic. I believe, however, that this is wrong. It would give an unparalleled meaning to *make*; much more probably the *that*-clause is used after *make* just as the infinitive would be: "make you to be etc." Such interchange of the infinitive and *that*-clause is very common.²⁶ Cf. Job 21.3 suffer me that I may speake, with Gen. 31.7 God suffered him not to hurt me. That the clause is naturally a substantive clause in English is indicated by the omission of *that*, as in Chaucer, D 617 That made me I coude noght withdrawe.

After classing Gen. 36.7 For their riches were more than that they might dwell together, and similarly Isa. 28.20, as consecutive, the author adds, "Usually *that* is omitted in such sentences," and quotes a number of clauses with *than* that clearly are not consecutive at all, as can readily be seen by supplying the supposedly omitted *that*; as in Dan. 3.19 they should heat the furnace one seuen times more then [that] it was wont to be heat. In fact, the examples with *than* represent elliptical clauses of several syntactical varieties, depending on the nature of the protasis, as can be seen by a glance at the quotations in the Oxf. Dic. under *than*.

The clauses classed under *but that* introducing "a negative consecutive clause" need reclassification, for not all here included are of a consecutive nature. An examination of the Oxf. Dic. examples of *but (that)* clauses reveals the fact, not specifically stated, that *but* governs *that*-clauses (probably originally substantive clauses after the preposition *but*) of various sorts, in which *but* has the general sense of except or without, and the *that*-clause denotes result, accompanying circumstance, a contrary reason, etc., being sometimes negative and sometimes affirmative. For example, while Exodus 21.29 he hath not kept him in, but that he hath killed a man, clearly denotes negative result, "so that he hath not", the idea is different in Josh. 22.17, 18 Is the iniquitie of Peor too little for vs, from which we are not cleansed vntil this day . . . But that ye must turne away this

²⁶ The two constructions are sometimes mixed; see the two examples from Chaucer, in the Chauc. Soc. Pub. 2d Series, 44, 1909, p. 140. See Matt. 8.34, Mark 6.8, Ex. 14.12, Ps. 50.16.

day from following the Lord? Here *but* has the sense of 'without' before a substantive clause = "without your turning away", which is not consecutive. Prov. 18.2 A foole hath no delight in vnderstanding, but that his heart may discover itselfe, is neither consecutive nor negative. *But* is here the cöordinate conjunction, and the *that*-clause is analogous to the object clause after *delight* and syntactically parallel with *in vnderstanding*. Literally, the Hebrew reads, "no delight in understanding, but in his heart's revealing itself". The same idea and syntax are found in Ezek. 33.11. In Luke 17.1 *but that* means 'that not', but the clause is not consecutive. Shearin is right in saying that Eph. 4.9 is "probably substantive", but it clearly is not consecutive. The classification of such different examples together merely because they contain a common phrase (formally), contributes nothing to the subject of syntax, and is hardly excused in this case by the "assumption that the clause is absolute in origin, *but* (*be+utan*) *that* being the syntactical equivalent of *excepto eo, quod,*" for *but that* is by no means of the same origin in all the cases cited. For Josh. 22.18 cf. Num. 16.13.

Under the Causal Clause Shearin says "Etymologically considered, the *that*-clause is perhaps appositional to the second (substantive) element in the compound *be + cause*; historically, however, it is merely a survival of the added relative common after all adverbial conjunctions etc." Here there appears to be logical confusion; for what is the difference between etymologically and historically? An etymology that does not reproduce the history of a syntactical phrase is scarcely to be trusted. *That* introducing a clause in apposition with *cause* in *be-cause* (as in Knight's Tale 2488 by the cause that they sholde ryse) is altogether different in syntax from *that* added after conjunctions. Of course after the appositional use had become stereotyped into the expression *because that*, this phrase naturally came by analogy to be classed with *after that, before that*, etc., of different origin. Indeed, this very phrase *because that*, may have contributed to the development of *if that, when that*, etc., though the main source of these be the use of the prepositions like *after, before*, etc., with *that* as pronominal object.

Under the introductory formula *seeing that*, indicating the ground of thought or action, is wrongly recorded Gen. 28.8, 9 And Esau seeing that the daughters of Canaan pleased not Isaac his father. Then went Esau vnto Ishmael. *Seeing that* here is not the stereotyped formula meaning 'since', 'because', but the ordinary present participle of *see*. The

participle, it is true, may denote cause (just as it may also denote time, or other attendant circumstance), but the meaning is not "because the daughters of C. pleased not his father", but "because *he saw* that the daughters of C. pleased not his father." This is obvious in the English, and unmistakable in the Hebrew, where the construction is paratactic: "and E. saw . . . and E. went." In the English *seeing* limits the subject directly, but when it is used in the sense of 'because', it is detached from the subject and goes with the verb, as in Ezek. 21.4. Moreover, in this sense *seeing* corresponds to a causal particle or the equivalent in the original, and not to the verb *see*, as it does in Gen. 28.8.

All the examples of *knowing that* "with like function" are to be rejected on the ground that it is not a stereotyped phrase meaning 'because', but is simply the participle of the verb *know* in ordinary use in agreement with the subject and followed by a *that* object clause, corresponding in every instance to an inflected participle of the original. The fact that in many instances the participle is in itself syntactically causal does not affect the case: it does not mean 'because', but 'because I (he, etc.) know.'

One important category Shearin omits altogether—the causal clause introduced by simple *that*, which is common Elizabethan, as in Ps. 120.5 Woe is me, that I sojourne in Mesech. This category should include many examples that Shearin has called Substantive Clauses of Specification; as Gen. 45.5 bee not grieved, nor angry with your selues, that yee sold me hither; II Sam. 2.5 blessed be ye of the LORD, that ye haue shewed this kindnesse. So Job 19.3, II Chron. 29.36 (Sept. = δὲ), Isa. 63.5, Jer. 25.10, Lam. 5.16, Luke 9.21, 10.21, 11.38, Acts 4.2 (= δὲ), I Cor. 11.2, etc. etc.²⁷

Under the Adverbial Clause of Specification is included the formula *in that*. It would have been well, however, to have referred to the original syntax here; namely, *in* (preposition) + *that* (demonstrative) + appositive substantive clause. Traces of this construction can still be seen in the varying meaning of *in*. In some cases *in* indicates the identity of the fact in the *that*-clause with the fact in the main clause; as in Matt. 26.12 *in that* she hath powred this ointment on my body, shee did it for my buriall. In other cases it indicates the ground or cause of the main action; as Rom. 8.3 what the law could not doe, *in that* it was weake through the flesh (ἐν ὧ causal); Heb. 5.7 was heard, *in that* he feared (margin

²⁷ In some instances the syntax varies between causal *that*-clauses and what was perhaps one of their sources,—the object clause after verbs like *desire*, extended by analogy to verbs like *rejoice*, and to adjectives like *glad*, *angry*, etc.

for his *pietie* = ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας). The term *specification* is inadequate to describe the latter sort; they should have been included among causal clauses, or at least have had a cross-reference to that category.

In the same category of Specification, under the formula *now that* are classed examples that belong in different categories. In II Sam. 14.15 Now (νῦν, nunc) therefore that I am come . . . it is because the people haue made me afraid, *now* has its full force as a temporal adverb and is syntactically separate from *that*, which introduces a substantive clause in apposition with *it*. The *that*-clause has the same construction in Eph. 4.9 Now (δὲ, autem) that he ascended, what is it but that hee also descended, being in apposition with *it*, and *now* being merely the logical particle introducing a new point in argument (see Oxf. Dic. s. v. *Now*, 10). Only one example quoted, Ps. 41.8 and now that he lyeth, he shall rise vp no more, properly belongs here, but in this the formula *now that* does not denote specification but cause, and should accordingly have been classed with the rest of the causal clauses.

Under *That* as a Pro-conjunction the first example is very doubtful; Jer. 20.16, 17 let that man be as the cities which the LORD ouerthrew . . . Because he slew me not from the wombe: or that my mother might haue beene my graue. Here the substitution of *because* for the second *that* does not give the right sense. Whatever may be the sense of the original (cf. Rev. Vers.), the translators of the A. V. apparently regarded *or* . . . *graue* as alternatively parallel with *let* . . . *wombe*, so that the *that*-clause is a clause of wish,²⁸ like Wint. Tale I. ii. 12 that may blow No sneaping winds at home.²⁹

Appendix IV contains the full list of references for consecutive *that*-clauses. In some cases it is difficult to distinguish between purpose clauses and clauses of conceived result. A large number of Shearin's examples, however, can hardly

²⁸ See also Oxf. Dic. s. v. *That*, conj. 2c.

²⁹ Shearin's explanation of the use of *that* as a pro-conjunction, which is far older than Elizabethan English, as due to a desire to avoid repetition, is hardly adequate, in view of the repetition of *that* itself. Several causes may have jointly contributed to its spread. In addition to those that have been suggested, one of the most natural is connected with *that* added to conjunctions. In such expressions as *before that* + clause, even after *before* became felt as a conjunction the *that*-clause would be felt as the unit depending on it. When several such units occurred in a series after one conjunction, they also would naturally be *that*-clauses, introduced in succession by *that*.

The Oxf. Dic. gives no examples of this use of *that* between 1175 and 1489, though it occurs in Chaucer (e. g. B 4555, Troil. II. 766.)

be anything but final clauses, as the sense of the English and the originals show. E. g. I Cor. 1.28, 29 And base things hath God chosen, yea and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are,⁸⁰ That no flesh should glory in his presence (=ὅπως μὴ καυχῆσθαι); 11.34 let him eate at home, that ye come not together vnto condemnation (=ἵνα μὴ συνέρχεσθε); so Ex. 28.32, 35, 43; 39.7, 23; Lev. 20.26; 21.23; Num. 32.9; Deut. 17.17; 21.23; Judg. 9.54; I Kings 2.15; 6.6; 18.44; Isa. 14.21; 48.9; 65.8; Lk. 4.42; 12.40; Rom. 11.8 (cf. 10); I Cor. 12.25; 16.2; Gal. 2.19; II Thess. 2.11; Tit. 3.7, 14; Heb. 11.5; I Pet. 2.9; Rev. 3.11; 7.1; 12.6; 18.4. If the thought in these examples be compared with that in the *so that*-clauses (App. V), the difference will be obvious. II Chron. 36.22 is marked doubtful. It contains two *that*-clauses, one final and one consecutive. Ezek. 1.1 is identical, but is cited without question as consecutive. Job. 9.32, 16.3, and John 3.1 belong to the group discussed by Shearin on pp. 50-52 (see p. 161 of this paper). Ezek. 20.32 is probably an appositive or a relative clause.

Among the references (App. V) for *so that* consecutive clauses are included three that are conditional, *so that* having the sense of 'provided that': I Kings 8.25 There shall not faile thee a man in my sight to sit on the Throne of Israel; so that thy children take heede; (margin = "*Heb. onely if*") ; the corresponding passage in II Chron. 6.16 There Israel: yet so, that thy children take heede; and Acts 20.24.

JOHN S. KENYON.

Butler College.

ESSAYS ON QUESTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE
OLD ENGLISH POEM OF BEOWULF.—By Knut
Stjerna, Ph. D., sometime Reader in Archæology in the
University of Upsala. Translated and edited by John R.
Clark Hall, M. A., Ph. D. (Viking Club Extra Series, Vol.
III.) 1912. 4to. XXXV + 284 pp.

This is a novel kind of book. Countless treatises, great and small, in which the various *Beowulf* problems are attacked from the philological side, have been showered upon the world of scholars. There have also appeared a few minor studies of certain archeological features of the poem, not

⁸⁰ Observe in this passage the nice use of *which* and *that*, where the original makes no distinction. *Which* has more emphasis as a characterizing relative (*qualis*), the phrase being a striking statement, while in the following the stress drops in accord with the more normal conception. Note, too, that the alterations of word stress are natural.